

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

DEPARTMENT OF PERMITTING SERVICES
MONTGOMERY COUNTY

- - - - - X
:
IGCC PUBLIC WORK SESSION :
:
- - - - - X

A meeting in the above-entitled matter was held on
Wednesday, July 16, 2014, commencing at 2:07 p.m., in the
County Office Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, 1st Floor
Auditorium, Rockville, Maryland 20850, before:

HEMAL MUSTAFA

INDEX

<u>STATEMENT OF:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Hemal Mustafa	3
Ralph Bennett	4
William LeRoy	6
Dan Coffey	9
Stuart Kaplow	16
Robert Harris	19
Lawrence Schoen	23

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 MR. MUSTAFA: Good afternoon, everybody. Please
3 have a seat. My name is Hemal Mustafa. I'm manager for --
4 Manager, Building Construction, Department of Permitting
5 Services. Mark Nauman couldn't come. He is our staff
6 member, and unfortunately, he's not here. So I'm -- I don't
7 want to cancel this.

8 I welcome all of you guys regarding this
9 International Green Construction Code work session. This is
10 the last session, and we welcome all the testimonies and
11 comments, and we're going to go through Chapter 10, which is
12 Existing Building; Chapter 11, Existing Building Site
13 Development; Appendix A, Project Electives; Appendix B,
14 Radon Mitigation; Appendix C, Optional Ordinance; Appendix
15 D, Enforcement Procedures.

16 With this, I'll open the floor. I'll invite the
17 participants who are going to present their testimony.
18 Stephen Cook? Not here. Okay. Second individual is Ralph
19 Bennett, please.

20 MR. BENNETT: Yes.

21 MR. MUSTAFA: Would you please come and --

22 MR. BENNETT: I assume this protocol applies.

23 MR. MUSTAFA: Yes, please.

24 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. My comments, since I
25 assume this to be the last of this series of sessions, my

1 comments are a little on the general side, but I have a
2 colleague who will speak specifically to Chapters 10 and 11
3 and others as well. We hope our recommendations and our
4 participation in these proceedings have shown the commitment
5 of the Potomac Valley Chapter of the AIA to the adoption of
6 a comprehensive sustainability code for Montgomery County.
7 We feel that the code, like sustainability itself, must
8 balance economy, environment, and equity. Finding this
9 balance will not be easy, and we are committed to the
10 success of this venture.

11 We wish to thank the Department of General
12 Services for their thoughtful and comprehensive review of
13 the document as users of its requirements and its
14 objectives. We would also note that very few of either DGS
15 or AIA suggestions are incorporated in the Department of
16 Permitting Services' draft of June 16th. We understand that
17 the draft on which we have been invited to comment over the
18 last weeks was an early draft. Its brevity is an indication
19 of how much DPS must draft into a legislative proposal. It
20 also shows that Montgomery County may be among the few
21 jurisdictions to adopt this code largely unamended.

22 We would also point out several questions which
23 must be addressed and have not been. The first is, is
24 ASHRAE 189.1 to be included as an alternative path, as the
25 model code prescribes? This has not been addressed. And

1 will DPS then be providing separate amendment
2 recommendations for ASHRAE 189.1? Thirdly, which of the
3 project electives will DPS include, as requires? This is
4 Appendix A. DPS draft includes no mention of Appendix A
5 beyond several requirements which are proposed to be moved
6 there. A model code -- the model code requires the
7 jurisdiction having authority to designate which or how many
8 project requirements must be met by the applicant. And then
9 regarding transition, what version of LEED and level of LEED
10 does the county intend to meet with the IgCC? In other
11 words, what are the objectives in terms of other standards
12 that are currently in use? Is Version -- 2009, Version 3,
13 going to be used or Version 4, and are the levels to be
14 achieved seen to be certified, silver, gold, et cetera?

15 And next to last, I would suggest, we have
16 recommended, and I'd like to reiterate, the importance of a
17 transition period during which several standards, including
18 LEED, may be accepted. There's great familiarity and a
19 developed infrastructure for LEED. There is no such
20 infrastructure available yet for the IgCC, and we suggest
21 that it needs time for this to develop and a transition
22 period, using existing standards.

23 Lastly, I have a series of typographical errors
24 that I will transmit in writing to you, which, or
25 inconsistencies that we believe exist in the proposal of

1 June 16th. So that concludes my testimony. I'd like to
2 give it over to Bill, who will speak to you about Chapters
3 10 and 11. Thank you.

4 MR. MUSTAFA: You're very welcome, sir.

5 MR. LEROY: So after taking a look at -- hi.

6 MR. MUSTAFA: Would you introduce yourself?

7 MR. LEROY: I'll introduce myself, sure. William
8 LeRoy and co-chair of the task force with AIA Potomac
9 Valley, and having had the chance to review both Chapters 10
10 and 11 with --

11 MR. MUSTAFA: Ma'am?

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hear you.

13 MR. LEROY: -- with Preservation colleagues --
14 having had the chance to review Chapters 10 and 11 with
15 Preservation colleagues, I have the following comments, in
16 addition to the recommendations that the task force
17 submitted earlier, and it's in relation to the version that
18 is currently proposed where Chapter 10 is, is proposed to be
19 deleted.

20 The deletion, let's see -- the Chapter 10 deletion
21 currently does not attempt to address the historic
22 buildings. Both Chapters 10 and 11, as written and amended
23 by our task force, attempt to do this. Though not very
24 well, they should be retained to reduce the potential
25 regulatory conflicts and interpretations between Department

1 of Permitting Services and Maryland Historic Trust. In
2 light of that, there is language in the current unedited
3 version that does conflict with the National Historic
4 Preservation Act where there is overlap between the State
5 Historic Preservation Office and the authority having
6 jurisdiction, which, in the way that it's written, conflicts
7 with the Historic Preservation Act.

8 Also, it's worth noting that the definition of
9 substantial improvement, as defined by the version DPS is
10 looking to review, still considers the market-based value of
11 a property where this may conflict with the International
12 Existing Building Code, where levels of alteration are
13 applicable. One of the concerns in recent -- in our
14 discussions internally, the recent economic swings can
15 negatively impact property values, and especially in older
16 and even historic properties can be negatively impacted.
17 Our recommendation is to align the Existing Building Code
18 with the IgCC with respect to alterations.

19 It's worth also noting that alterations are not
20 included in the first chapter in the scope of the code
21 proposed, and we would like to include renovations in
22 addition to the additions. I think in Chapter 1, Section
23 103, it talks about new construction and additions, but it
24 ignores the renovations. That said, with the current
25 population, density of about 2,000 people per square mile in

1 Montgomery County, along with about 155,000 small businesses
2 -- and I pulled this from, like, LexisNexis -- existing
3 buildings can actually have a very big impact on greenhouse
4 gas reductions in the county.

5 When existing buildings undergo renovations, the
6 Green Code should and can -- can and should apply. The DPS
7 draft does not address the existing building renovations as
8 such, and I think it's referred to as pertinences, is
9 currently listed in that chapter of scope, and I don't
10 believe that that's sufficient, as it's outlined, for, to
11 cover renovations. I think it should be more explicit than
12 that.

13 And, lastly, with respect to Chapter 10, the zEPI
14 issue being applied to an addition raises a question and a
15 concern if it's being attached to an existing building.
16 zEPI is typically looked upon as a whole-building
17 performance aspect, and so if the draft code doesn't cover
18 renovations, how can zEPI, if it's absorbed in this code,
19 apply to a whole building if, in some cases, an addition
20 does not in fact have a separation?

21 Without retaining Section, or Chapter 10, that is,
22 and revising Section 605, which is the envelope
23 requirements, an impact on historic listed and eligible
24 properties is a likely negative outcome that can impact
25 character, with projections, thermal insulation

1 requirements, moisture drying, and other important
2 character-defining features that, if it's not included in
3 this version of the code, can have a negative outcome. So
4 that's Chapter 10.

5 MR. MUSTAFA: Okay. Thank you very much.

6 MR. LEROY: Thanks.

7 MR. MUSTAFA: Thanks. Okay. Next person,
8 Catherine Provost, please. Catherine Provost? Okay. Next
9 person, Dan Coffey, please.

10 MR. COFFEY: Hi. My name is Dan Coffey. I'm the
11 chair for the USGBC, Montgomery County Branch, and my
12 comments today are going to be more general, overarching
13 comments. The technical comments that we participated with
14 the AIA Potomac Valley and those comments from last July and
15 those, those comments that we felt strongly about then
16 still, still apply.

17 The Montgomery County Branch of National Capital
18 Region for USGBC really applauds the county for soliciting
19 input from the industry professional groups, the public, and
20 other stakeholders in adopting and implementing the IgCC
21 code modification and amendments. Members of the Branch
22 have actively participated with AIA Potomac Valley Task
23 Force from the July 2013 recommendations, and the board
24 members have attended many of the work group sessions with
25 DPS.

1 Jeremy Sigmon from the USGBC National Capital
2 Chapter, which is what we call the mother ship or the main
3 national chapter downtown, was actually one of the original
4 members that created the IgCC code for the ICC, so one of
5 the original authors of that. And in a discussion that I
6 had with him about a week ago, he really reminded me of the
7 real key four objectives that served as the founding
8 strategic precepts for the IgCC.

9 The first was really to create a code that is
10 adopted and applied as a building code and not some sort of
11 voluntary incentive that could be seen as an excuse not to
12 pursue LEED or other strategies that go beyond the minimum,
13 so really to make this a code minimum and not to be going
14 beyond that, that strategy.

15 To coordinate with the public input so that the
16 new code receives broad support and is implemented
17 successfully. This includes working closely with
18 implementing agencies, who will be the ones to shoulder the
19 burden of enforcement and education of their audiences.

20 The third point, to coordinate with other laws and
21 policies that govern real estate and infrastructure so that
22 the code actually does work when it's applied.

23 The fourth comment then was to permit leadership
24 programs, like LEED, ASHRAE 189, and others, to serve as
25 alternative means for compliance. This reduces the burden

1 on the building department during a transition and allows
2 LEED to coach the government regulators on how green
3 buildings are documented and should be -- and should provide
4 an incentive for developers to choose or to do more than
5 minimum code compliance. Since LEED will offer the ROI via
6 branding marketing that the code will not offer, this will
7 differentiate the innovators from the rest.

8 With those four elements, any code that includes
9 green building ideas from LEED or IgCC or wherever would
10 really be a better code than what we have today. So we do
11 applaud the sort of forward motion in this process.

12 Montgomery County Branch respectfully suggests
13 that we learn some -- learn from the early leaders in the
14 code adoption. We had a recent discussion with David Epley,
15 who was the coordinating person for the IgCC implementation
16 for DCRA, and David went through a number of sort of really
17 key lessons learned from their process, some of which were
18 things that went well, some are things that didn't go so
19 well. And the first one really was to create a construction
20 codes advisory board to review all of the building codes.
21 They were then subdivided by code types. The members were
22 then selected from a variety of expertise areas in each
23 group. The members consisted of public officials,
24 architects, engineers, subject matter experts, builders, and
25 contractors and citizens. The meetings were transparent,

1 discussions were made public, and documents created and
2 decisions made were published publicly.

3 They reviewed each code section in detail, made
4 recommendations to the jurisdiction. That collaborative
5 process they marked as one of the key elements to a
6 successful implementation. They do have some very unique
7 situations in D.C. that are different than Montgomery County
8 but, I think, again, a collaborative process to really help
9 bolster this. They went through three public comment
10 periods. The revisions were made and were, and then they
11 were published publicly through -- but really was no need
12 for hearing or debate. It was very little comments, very
13 little revisions because of the collaborative process they
14 went through early.

15 The third point was, some of the revisions to the
16 IgCC 2015 were also considered heavily since the 2012
17 version had some conflicts and some obstacles that needed to
18 be addressed for sort of smoother transition to implement
19 the code. And he really did stress to really consider --
20 looking at some of those changes between those two versions
21 really helped in their process to understand some of the
22 complexities of that.

23 Significant time and effort was employed to create
24 the administrative process and procedures and forms to
25 administer the IgCC. DCRA actually purchased the rights to

1 make the IgCC unique to them, with a custom cover, the
2 ability to edit chapters and comments and entire chapter
3 modifications to make the codebook unique to their
4 jurisdiction and more user-friendly for the practitioners,
5 designers, and code enforcement. Those changes were
6 actually written right into the codebook so you didn't have
7 to correlate between a standard code document and an
8 amendment, and they found that that was one of the comments
9 that came back, especially from the practitioners and
10 designers, that really was a good feedback that helped them
11 tremendously in their process.

12 The fifth element was that the enforcement and
13 fines were revised to make the cost of noncompliance to be
14 more than compliance, okay, because they didn't want to just
15 create a free pass for somebody to pay to get out from
16 underneath of it. Again, it's code minimum; so they really
17 should be complying with it. So it really shouldn't be a
18 big problem.

19 Education and implementation efforts were made to
20 make the process simple and understandable to follow. They
21 did a tremendous amount of outreach, education with the
22 community to help them understand that process, created
23 documents to help the administrative process flow, so flow
24 diagrams and other supporting information to make it very
25 understandable.

1 The next element was the flexibility with unique
2 projects and phased work, which is common in tenant
3 alterations and building renovations. So, again, having
4 that ability to have code modifications done or have the
5 code official have the ability to make some commonsense
6 judgments was really key to making a project successful,
7 because really, the overarching piece here is to really,
8 let's find a way to make the project successful and not find
9 a way to say no to the project.

10 The Montgomery County Branch -- those are my
11 comments from DCRA's discussion -- the Montgomery County
12 Branch, as the board sat and also thought about other things
13 that were important and -- that we would also want to not
14 recommend that certain classes of buildings require to meet
15 LEED, for instance, things like schools and other public
16 buildings, because we have such a diversity of buildings in
17 the county and schools have other things that are mandated
18 on them from state agencies, funding requirements, and
19 things that -- they have regulations from that side. So I
20 think that they probably should be one, at least, until we
21 get through some of these things, that they should be
22 allowed more flexibility and have the option of meeting the
23 IgCC or, alternatively, ASHRAE 189, LEED, or other
24 applicable standards that they find more effective for
25 their, for their type of building.

1 And sort of in closing, the Montgomery County
2 Branch of the USGBC would encourage a similar collaborative
3 public and private effort to make the implementation a real
4 example of sustainable partnership and a positive role model
5 for other jurisdictions to follow. Right now a lot of
6 people are watching what we're doing here in the county.
7 We're getting a lot of questions. So we really want to make
8 sure that this gets implemented well. With public support,
9 the implementation will be successful.

10 The real innovations and future success will not
11 come from regulatory solutions. They will come from
12 stimulating the creativity of the science and technology
13 innovators to lead the way to a more successful and
14 sustainable future. We've always got a lot of very
15 innovative minds in our county and a lot of people willing
16 to go beyond the code minimum. We've seen that from a lot
17 of the commercial real estate developers. We're going to
18 start to see that from other market sectors, as well, as
19 they start to recognize the benefits of these buildings and
20 the performance of it, and I think the county is doing some
21 other things with energy benchmarking that are going to be
22 supporting those things as well, so yeah, great. Thank you.

23 MR. MUSTAFA: All right. Thank you very much.

24 MR. COFFEY: Uh-huh.

25 MR. MUSTAFA: Thank you. So next person is Stu

1 Kaplow, please.

2 MR. KAPLOW: I'll just hand you a document.

3 MR. MUSTAFA: Thank you. Thank you.

4 MR. KAPLOW: She's got it.

5 MR. MUSTAFA: Yes. Thank you.

6 MR. KAPLOW: Thank you. My name is Stuart Kaplow.
7 I'm a green building and sustainability attorney, and I'm
8 fortunate today to be representing a coalition of 114
9 Maryland businesses that have come together under the
10 umbrella of the Asphalt Alliances. The Asphalt Alliance
11 members, more than two-thirds of them have done work in the
12 National Capital Region this past calendar year. So many of
13 them are obviously directly impacted by this and other codes
14 in Montgomery County.

15 First and foremost, my clients are supportive of
16 this effort. We think it's a great effort, supportive of
17 Montgomery County's efforts to move towards the IgCC, and
18 again, we thank you for this process and the opportunity to
19 comment. We've commented previously and provided detailed
20 written suggestions. I'm here today to talk specifically
21 about, given the schedule that the county is following,
22 about Appendix A, and I do that because in our earlier
23 comments we specifically recommended that some of the
24 language be moved to Appendix A, and that is the language
25 with respect to hardscape mitigation.

1 Before I discuss that very briefly, what I've
2 handed to you is actually an amendment that we believe will
3 be adopted, though there's no certainty until October, but
4 will be adopted in the 2015 version of the IgCC. That is,
5 it's an amendment through the ICC process, and that
6 amendment addresses my client's issue; that is, if we were
7 not talking about the 2012 version but rather the 2015
8 version, I likely would not be sitting here talking to you
9 because the form code addresses the very issue, or the new
10 form code will address the very issue I'm here to talk
11 about.

12 And again, very quickly, there are alternate
13 methods. We provided suggestions for three ways to address
14 our issue. Our issue, very simply put, is that the current
15 form code, when addressing heat island mitigation, so that
16 sort of -- and remember, Montgomery County has no current
17 laws addressing heat island mitigation, nor does any
18 jurisdiction in Maryland. So this is brand-new stuff. Some
19 of the science may even be a little fuzzy, but it's clear
20 we're all going to be addressing heat island mitigation now
21 as a mandatory requirement -- that asphalt pavement and, in
22 particular, pervious asphalt pavement be included in that
23 mix of ways that heat island mitigation can be accomplished.

24 The form code doesn't do that. It only allows for
25 four methods today. One is the planting of shade trees.

1 The other is trellises. One has to do with shading from
2 adjoining buildings. The fourth has to do with the use of a
3 concrete -- concrete products, permeable concrete products.
4 And we're suggesting that a pervious asphalt product, and
5 we've given the specs.

6 There's an -- there are actually two ASTM
7 standards. The Maryland Department of Environment adopted
8 one. The Maryland Highway Administration adopted another
9 one. But there are two accepted ASTM standards for pervious
10 asphalt that provide the 16 percent air void, and that 16
11 percent air void, allowing the air to move in and out of the
12 product, does accomplish much of the heat island effect.
13 One of the reasons I handed up the proposed change to the
14 2015 version of the IgCC is it provides reference on the
15 second page to the EPA study, where EPA has approved the
16 asphalt product that we're talking about, as well as the
17 concrete product.

18 So, again, I won't dwell on because we're simply
19 really repeating the earlier comments that we submitted, but
20 we believe that if Montgomery County is going to, is going
21 to regulate urban heat island effect, which arguably may be
22 an issue in some of the urbanized areas of the county but
23 certainly has much less import in the suburban and rural
24 areas of the county -- certainly when building a school on a
25 sort of typical elementary school site, urban heat island

1 effect is obviously not a huge issue for that project -- we
2 suggest the proper place for it is in Appendix A, is as a
3 voluntary compliance path, and we've recommended that, and
4 again, as you're considering Appendix A, we'd ask that you
5 again look at that.

6 And I'll close with where I began, that the
7 Asphalt Institute, the group that I'm here representing
8 today, is a coalition of 114 businesses that actually employ
9 over 3,000 individuals that work regularly in either
10 Montgomery and/or Prince George's County, and the allied and
11 associated businesses that participate in this alliance are
12 a total of just over, it's now 308 businesses. So it's a
13 fair number of businesses that work regularly in Montgomery
14 County that are truly impacted. So we'd hope that you would
15 allow the asphalt pavement products to be included.

16 MR. MUSTAFA: Thank you. Thank you very much.

17 MR. KAPLOW: Thank you very much.

18 MR. MUSTAFA: Next person is Robert Harris,
19 please.

20 MR. HARRIS: Good afternoon. I'm Bob Harris. I'm
21 with the law firm of Lerch, Early & Brewer here in
22 Montgomery County. First of all, let me apologize. I'm
23 kind of late to the party here unlike a lot of the people
24 here. I've really just started getting into this this week
25 at the request of a client, and I am certainly no expert on

1 either the Green Construction Code or building codes in
2 general. I do, however, represent many builders and
3 developers in Montgomery County that, I think, are really
4 just waking up to this potential transformation here, and so
5 my comments are very general; they're not highly prepared,
6 but I think they relate to what you're doing here.

7 First of all, as you no doubt appreciate, any time
8 there is a change in a code, it is of concern to an industry
9 that makes its living around a code, such as a building
10 code, and it's particularly concerning if the changes that
11 are in play are different than what they're used to in other
12 jurisdictions where they work, as well as what they're used
13 to in Montgomery County. They do kind of get set in their
14 ways. So there's a natural anxiety here.

15 It's particularly an anxiety, I think, for larger
16 commercial projects because of the gestation period that
17 these projects have, as opposed to a home or a small
18 commercial project. The site plan approval process for
19 these projects alone can take well over a year, but many of
20 the conditions and requirements are baked into those site
21 plan approvals, and if those are inconsistent with a code
22 change that comes along, that developer is put in a, quite a
23 predicament. Even the building permit plans that they have
24 to produce for these projects take a long time, and if the
25 code is changing while those permit plans are in the works,

1 it creates a real unknown and a potential problem.

2 The -- I've heard a couple of comments here today
3 in terms of an option for keeping LEED as an option in the
4 code, and I hadn't explored that before, but that might be
5 something worth considering. At least that is the code
6 requirement, the policy requirement to which pretty much
7 everyone now is accustomed.

8 Similarly, I think there has to be more than a
9 normal phase in for application of the code to projects that
10 are somewhere in the works. Again, a site plan taking more
11 than a year and building plans taking six months or whatever
12 they may take, a two-month phase in that I think is normal
13 may be insufficient and will catch too many people in the,
14 in the changing tide there.

15 A third aspect of commercial projects, in
16 particular, is many times the core and shell of the building
17 are built well in advance of the tenant fit-out, and if the,
18 if the core and shell is subject to one code and then the
19 tenant fit-outs are subject to another code, there may be a
20 situation where the two don't meet and you're precluded from
21 accommodating that. That has to be considered in some
22 respect.

23 Fourthly, while I work on a lot of office
24 projects, I work on some -- and a lot of residential
25 projects as well -- I work on some retail projects. I think

1 they're fewer in number than office and residential by a
2 long shot, and many times I've found that various codes,
3 whether they be zoning codes or building codes, don't, don't
4 have retail in mind when they're being written. And I'm
5 here today particularly on behalf of one retail developer
6 that says -- you know, they are concerned about how this
7 might affect specific development relating to retail.

8 Specifically in that regard, from what they've
9 looked at superficially so far with this, some of the
10 lighting requirements, in terms of dimming and daylight
11 harvesting, are inconsistent with the retail tenant policies
12 and practices and may be a problem. Some of the submetering
13 requirements that I think are in here are inconsistent with
14 the way the industry typically operates and may be a
15 problem, and I think there are others as well. Again, I've
16 had, you know, very little opportunity to dig into this and
17 I'm not an expert; so I would, you know, plan to follow up
18 with this with both written comments and, if we have the
19 opportunity, more specific interaction too. So that's my
20 comment. Thank you.

21 MR. MUSTAFA: Thank you. Thank you very much.
22 Did I miss anybody?

23 MR. SCHOEN: I haven't signed up, but I --

24 MR. MUSTAFA: Oh, you can go, sir.

25 MR. SCHOEN: I'm yet another latecomer. My name

1 is Lawrence Schoen. I am a licensed engineer. I work for
2 Schoen Engineering Inc., and I'm also ASHRAE's vice chair of
3 the Standard 189.1 committee. We actually have quite a bit
4 of, quite a bit of representation in the State of Maryland.
5 The chair of the committee is Dr. Andy Persily, who works
6 just up the street at NIST, and of course, 189.1 is part --
7 it's one of the, as people have said, it's one of the
8 compliance pathways that's allowed in the IgCC.

9 189.1, the group is -- the standard is actually
10 cosponsored by IES, the Industrial -- the Illuminating
11 Engineering Society, as well as ASHRAE, AIA, and USGBC. In
12 recognition of what some people have already said, that the
13 LEED ratings were never intended as a, as a legal
14 regulation, this one is. I know some issues have come up in
15 the past. I know some have come up here. We've been
16 through an extensive consensus process on 189.1. So I guess
17 I offer myself personally, and I'm sure Dr. Persily would
18 assist in, the county, in any history of those discussions.
19 I also want to clarify, I'm not speaking for any
20 organization right now, speaking for myself, haven't been
21 authorized by any of my clients or ASHRAE or anybody. So I
22 speak for my own personal opinions.

23 So just as an example, for instance, the heat
24 island effect that was brought up, there are six ways to
25 meet it in Section 5.3.2.1 of ASHRAE Standard 189.1. So I

1 guess I would encourage the county, as well as individuals,
2 to look at those options to see if those actually meet, meet
3 the needs. I believe there's more flexibility in there,
4 which kind of brings me to another point, which is the
5 transition that people have suggested.

6 I have a great personal investment in seeing
7 Standard 189.1 succeed and in seeing the IgCC succeed, and I
8 support personally that concept of transition because -- I
9 mean, there are some agencies of the federal government that
10 have adopted the IgCC and/or 189.1, but because of this
11 increased familiarity that's needed in the design community
12 -- and I'm part of the design community -- I think that's a
13 great idea.

14 Furthermore, in support of that, there was just a
15 brand-new recently signed memorandum of understanding
16 between, between the ICC, ASHRAE, and USGBC where, where the
17 189.1 committee will be sort of the source of the technical
18 content for the Green Code, the ICC will be the source of
19 compliance, and USGBC is in there. The roles are not
20 clearly defined yet, but there is this MOU. So the outcome
21 of that, I believe, will be better support materials and
22 implementation materials for the design community that will
23 move it more towards, as mature as the LEED rating system
24 is, as people have mentioned.

25 So I guess I'm speaking (a) in support of the

1 transition period and (b) in support of look to the future,
2 there's this new MOU, and I think we hope to get there. I
3 guess that's all I have to say. Thank you.

4 MR. MUSTAFA: Okay. Thank you very much. Anybody
5 else?

6 (No audible response.)

7 MR. MUSTAFA: Thank you all for coming. We'll
8 conclude this.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Excuse me. I have one
10 question. What is the duration of the comment period? Does
11 it close today? Does it extend until the end of the month?
12 How much further?

13 MR. MUSTAFA: I'll get back to you. I don't know.
14 I'm filling in for Nauman, and he's not here right now.
15 Okay.

16 MR. LEROY: Can I add a little bit of additional
17 testimony on Chapter 11, if I could?

18 MR. MUSTAFA: Yes, if you want to stand up.

19 MR. LEROY: It'll be just two seconds.

20 MR. MUSTAFA: Okay.

21 MR. LEROY: Sure. I just wrote this at the --
22 just to kind of bring attention to the fact that in Chapter
23 11 existing building sites is currently not proposed to be
24 deleted, and I wanted to confirm that. If that's in fact
25 the case, then it may be a conclusion that the draft version

1 by DPS appears to support the razing of existing buildings
2 in favor of new construction and/or additions but not
3 necessarily the renovation, the adaptive reuse, the
4 restoration, or preservation of existing buildings on
5 existing building -- on existing sites. The two chapters
6 together address whole-building issues related to existing
7 buildings and their properties, and that's, that's what I
8 wanted to add, so thanks.

9 MR. MUSTAFA: Thank you very much.

10 (Whereupon, at 2:46 p.m., the meeting was
11 adjourned.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

✓ Digitally signed by Wendy Campos

ELECTRONIC CERTIFICATE

DEPOSITION SERVICES, INC., hereby certifies that the foregoing pages represent an accurate transcript of the electronic sound recording of the proceedings before the Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services, in the matter of:

IGCC PUBLIC WORK SESSION

Wendy Campos

Wendy Campos

July 17, 2014